



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/171,921	10/29/1998	HILARY LYNDSEY WILLIAMS	36-1288	8650

7590 02/11/2002

NIXON & VANDERHYE
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 222014714

EXAMINER

LANEAU, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

m

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/171,921

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, HILARY LYNDASAY

Examiner

Ronald Laneau

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/24/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 9/24/01 has been entered. Claims 77-80 are added and claims 1-80 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-11, 16-29, and 77-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The newly added limitations in claim 1 "at least some of which define selection for display of a further one of the pages from the multiplicity of pages, the further one of the pages being adjacent to a previously selected page being currently displayed" is not described in the specifications. Applicant has pointed out in his remarks that this feature is supported in figure 18 and its corresponding written description but the examiner does not find this particular limitations in reading the description of figure 18. Applicant is reminded to point out the specific lines and columns where these limitations can be found.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14, 16-29, and 77-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al (5,902,968) in view of Metroka et al (5,754,645).

As per claim 1, Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines 39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44). Sato et al do not teach a processing means to provide a mode response selected from a multiplicity of stored possible modes and a display screen but Metroka et al teach a display 106 announced with a synthesized voice, or displayed and announced (see abstract and figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to utilize the display screen as taught by Metroka et al into the device of Sato et al because it would allow a user to see what's being inputted into the device and also it would be very suitable for inputting figures and characters, etc into a data processing.

As per claim 2, Sato et al teach a detection means which comprises at least one acceleration detection means responsive to movement of the computer to produce the output electrical signal as claimed (see figure 1, 2a).

Art Unit: 2674

As per claim 3, Sato et al teach a plurality of acceleration detection means to produce an electrical output signal representative to movement in respective directions (see figure 1, 2a-2c).

As per claim 4, Sato et al teach sensors which detect movement in the x and y directions as claimed.

As per claims 5 and 6, the movement detected by Sato et al's device is capable of generating alphanumeric or graphical data and said alphanumeric or graphical data is stored in a data store since using a computer as claimed.

As per claim 7, the pen-shaped input taught by Sato et al is connected to a processing device which receives the output of the alphanumeric or graphical data by the transmitting means.

As per claim 8, Metroka et al teach a display 106 announced with a synthesized voice, or displayed and announced (see abstract and figure 1) and it certainly can modify the output of the detected movement data.

As per claims 9-11, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to effect scrolling of displayed information based on detected movement data, to have a relative tilting movement which causes the display information stores as to one or other side of the current display, a rolling movement which causes the display information stored as above or below the current display information for the same reasons given in claim 1.

As per claims 12-14 and 78-80, Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines 39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44). Sato et al do not teach

Art Unit: 2674

a processing means to provide a mode response selected from a multiplicity of stored possible modes but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to this particular element to Sato et al because it would be very suitable for inputting figures and characters, etc into a data processing.

As per claims 16-22, the examiner takes the Official notice that a portable device having a user's password, a sound input device, speech or other sound signals, a sound output in combination with a radio transceiver whereby cellular or radio telephony networks, radio transmission or infrared transmission means, transmission of coded signals including a message for display is well known in the art.

As per claims 23-29, it is also well known to have a processing means responsive to received encoded radio signals to activate a paging alert which comprises a tone, a operation of a vibrating means and that the portable computer houses in a casing shape to facilitate a user holding the computer as a writing stylus.

As per claim 77, Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines 39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44).

6. Claims 30-45, 47-72, and 74-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taguchi et al (5,215,397) in view of Sato et al (5,902,968) and in further view of Fujiwara (5,301,222).

As per claims 30 and 31, Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines 39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44). Sato et al do not teach a casing including an angular shaping but Taguchi et al teach a portable computer being housed in a casing shaped to facilitate a user holding the computer as a writing stylus, a casing including an angular shaping being such as to provide a natural viewing angle of the incorporated display while the casing is held as a writing stylus (see figure 1). Neither Sato nor Taguchi et al teach a casing including an angular shaping being such as to provide a natural viewing angle of the incorporated display while the casing is held as a writing stylus but Fujiwara teaches an LCD display 3 seen in figure 1 which provides a viewing angle while the casing is held as a writing stylus. Neither Sato nor Taguchi et al nor Fujiwara teach a processing means to provide a mode response selected from a multiplicity of stored possible modes but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to add this particular element to the combined device of Sato et al and Taguchi et al and Fujiwara because it would be very suitable for inputting figures and characters into a data processing.

As per claims 32, 51, 52, and 63, Taguchi et al teach a portable computer comprising a housing incorporating a visible display screen, a housing that is held in a user's hand (see figure 1). Taguchi et al do not teach a movement detector which produces an electrical output but Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines

Art Unit: 2674

39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44). Sato et al do not teach a processing means to provide a mode response selected from a multiplicity of stored possible modes but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to this particular element to Sato et al because it would be very suitable for inputting figures and characters, etc into a data processing.

As per claim 33, Sato et al teach a detection means which comprises at least one acceleration detection means responsive to movement of the computer to produce the output electrical signal as claimed (see figure 1, 2a).

As per claim 34, Sato et al teach a plurality of acceleration detection means to produce an electrical output signal representative to movement in respective directions (see figure 1, 2a-2c).

As per claim 35, Sato et al teach sensors which detect movement in the x and y directions as claimed.

As per claims 36, 37, and 64, the movement detected by Sato et al's device is capable of generating alphanumeric or graphical data and said alphanumeric or graphical data is stored in a data store since using a computer as claimed.

As per claim 38, the pen-shaped input taught by Sato et al is connected to a processing device which receives the output of the alphanumeric or graphical data by the transmitting means.

As per claim 39, the computer processing means taught by Sato et al includes a display screen wherein one can modify the output of the detected movement data.

As per claims 40-45 and 67-72, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to effect scrolling of displayed information based on detected movement data, to have a relative tilting movement which causes the display information stores as to one or other side of

Art Unit: 2674

the current display, a rolling movement which causes the display information stored as above or below the current display information for the same reasons given in claim 1.

As per claims 47-50, the examiner takes the Official notice that a portable device having a user's password, a sound input device, speech or other sound signals, a sound output in combination with a radio transceiver whereby cellular or radio telephony networks, radio transmission or infrared transmission means, transmission of coded signals including a message for display is well known in the art.

As per claims 53-57, it is also well known to have a processing means responsive to received encoded radio signals to activate a paging alert which comprises a tone, a operation of a vibrating means and that the portable computer houses in a casing shape to facilitate a user holding the computer as a writing stylus.

As per claims 58-62, Taguchi et al teach a portable computer being housed in a casing shaped to facilitate a user holding the computer as a writing stylus, a casing including an angular shaping being such as to provide a natural viewing angle of the incorporated display while the casing is held as a writing stylus (see figure 1).

As per claims 65 and 66, Taguchi et al teach a handheld computer which is transmitted externally to another data processing device and one can be able to modify the visual display output (see figure 1).

7. Claims 15, 46, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al (5,902,968) in view of Andrews (5,757,271).

Art Unit: 2674

As per claim 15, Sato et al teach a portable pen-shaped input which comprises a movement detection to produce an electrical output signal representative of such movement, a means for determining detected movement data defining a user's intention based on the initial inclination angle (see col. 5, lines 39-67 and col. 6, lines 1-44). Sato et al do not teach a proximity detection means which provides signal indicative of the proximity of the computer but Andrews teaches a proximity detector that detects whether or not a remote unit is within a proximity of said portable computer (see abstract, col. 8, lines 5-11). Neither Sato nor Andrews teach a processing means to provide a mode response selected from a multiplicity of stored possible modes but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add this particular element to Sato et al and Andrews because it would be very suitable for inputting figures and characters, etc into a data processing.

As per claims 46 and 73, see above rejection to claim 39. Andrews teaches a proximity detector that detects whether or not a remote unit is within proximity of said portable computer (see abstract, col. 8, lines 5-11).

-

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/24/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments about a casing including an angular shaping being such as to provide a natural viewing angle of the incorporated display while the casing is held as a writing stylus' has been addressed by the addition of Fujiwara.

Art Unit: 2674

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 305-308-6606, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (703) 305-3973. The
examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Ronald Laneau

February 8, 2002


RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600